



Chicago Province of the Society of Jesus

2050 North Clark Street • Chicago, Illinois 60614-4788 • (312) 975-6363 • (312) 975-0230 FAX

February 17, 1995

Rev. Donald J. McGuire, S.J.
201 Dempster Street
Evanston, Illinois 60201

CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Don, P.C.


Thank you very much for our conversation of February 9th. It was a worthwhile meeting, I think. It was valuable for Jim Gschwend and me to hear your understanding of the events of the weekend of January 21, 1995. For my part, I think it was valuable for you to hear the fraternal concern I continue to have for you.

As I told you when we spoke, I think that a follow-up letter is necessary. In writing this, I have three goals: (1) to support you; (2) to summarize the history of your dealings with several major superiors regarding certain specific incidents; and (3) to clarify what continues to be expected of you in the wake of these dealings.

But before any of that, Don, please know that I want you to do well in your ministry. Beyond my own personal support, I want you to feel the support of the Chicago Province. This letter is going to sound a bit businesslike at times, I suspect; nonetheless, I hope it communicates my desire to encourage what is good and holy in your work. Brad and I very much want for you to feel that you are a valued member of the Chicago Province.

First, let's review recent history. Summaries such as this can be helpful in reminding us what happened, and who said what to whom. I will begin with the provincialate of Bob Wild, and I will conclude with our meeting this February 9th.

On February 22, 1991, Father Provincial Robert A. Wild, S.J., spoke to you about general prudence on your part regarding your nearness to minors. He formally confirmed his request to you in his letter some five days later. On February 27, 1991, he wrote:



01183

I therefore asked of you two changes in your behavior, and you readily agreed to both. First of all, I ask that you not travel on any overnight trip with any boy or girl under the age of 18 and preferably even under the age of 21. Secondly, I ask you to confine any further contact that you might have with [REDACTED] to situations in which at least one of his parents would also be present. This latter command I did not give you because of any wrong doing that I noted in your behavior; I think it simply a matter of careful prudence under the circumstances. Both of these directives, as I said, you accepted readily and agreed to observe fully.

On April 30, 1993, I met with you. We discussed the [REDACTED] allegation. You denied any overt impropriety on your part, either concerning sexual misconduct or disobedience to Father Wild's directive. Regarding the latter, you noted that other adults (priest, doctor, dentist) were along on that trip and therefore you felt that, technically, you had not disobeyed Fr. Wild's command. However, you acknowledged that, in a larger sense, the question of obedience to Father Wild's directive was indeed at stake; you said that you would be more attentive in the future. You subsequently underwent an evaluation at St. Luke Institute in Suitland, Maryland (May, 1993), and a therapeutic program at Philadelphia's Villa St. John Vianney Hospital (summer 1993 - early 1994).

In a January 28, 1994, conversation following your departure from St. John's, Father Provincial Bradley M. Schaeffer, S.J., told you once again of the extreme urgency of obeying, in full spirit, Father Wild's February, 1991, directives.

In the summer of 1994, you were informed that we had received a complaint from [REDACTED], who reported to us her pained suspicions of many years back. She wanted to speak of her sense that your relationship several decades ago with her son, [REDACTED], may not have been a fully proper one. She made no direct allegation. [REDACTED] himself later came to the provincial office to discuss his past relationship with you. He, too, made no direct allegation regarding his past encounters with you.

You had another meeting with Father Schaeffer on December 15, 1994. As I have told you, I was not privy to the substance of that conversation. You say that it was a very encouraging one.

The events of the weekend of January 21, 1995, prompted our February 9th meeting.

Frankly, I wish you could have been more precise regarding exactly what happened that weekend. Obviously, [REDACTED] most vehemently requests that you have no further contact with her son [REDACTED], nor with any member of her family. [REDACTED] did not make a specific allegation regarding sexual misconduct on your part; she will not be pursuing the matter. However, she states that her family fears you. You emphasized in our February 9th meeting that you did not engage in any inappropriate behavior, sexual or nonsexual, with [REDACTED]. Further, you stated your opinion that [REDACTED] fears are based on her own psychological instability rather than on anything you did or said the weekend of January 21st.

Again, it is not entirely clear what occurred to warrant this reaction from the [REDACTED] family. Still, having listened to you in our meeting last week, I think it is reasonable to say that you did not exercise good judgment by being directly involved in whatever situation led to this fear.

This brings us to the very delicate question of trust. As I told you in our meeting, I trusted you enough not to call you back to Chicago immediately following the [REDACTED] phone call. I permitted you to continue with your proposed itinerary, thus delaying by almost three weeks our meeting regarding the [REDACTED] incident.

Repeatedly, Don, you have expressed your desire and need to be trusted. Trust must be earned, and then safeguarded. I hope you can see that I have some legitimate questions here, as I told you in our meeting. We have the [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] complaints, all lodged in the last several years. Perhaps the question is not so much one of trust as of judgment. I simply think that you exercise bad judgment at times, as we have seen again in the events of the weekend of January 21st. It would be irresponsible of your superiors not to hold you accountable for your bad judgment.

To assist you in avoiding such problems in the future, I am reminding you of the standing restrictions which were imposed and reinforced following the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] complaints. Further, in accord with their request, you are to have no contact with any member of the immediate [REDACTED] family. Also, I am amplifying Bob Wild's 1991 directive: please do not travel on any overnight trip with any person, male or female, under the age of 21. In addition, I ask that you exercise extreme caution to avoid any occasion that would find you alone, behind closed doors, with anyone under the age of 21.

Finally, I would like to stress the importance of protecting your physical and psychic health. You asked that Dr. [REDACTED] assist in your after-care. His own assessment of September 20, 1994, recommends that you decrease the number of your commitments worldwide. I might add that I concur with Dr. Murrell wholeheartedly when he writes in that evaluation that you "need to accept the nature of the culture of our day and be wiser, more prudent" in how you relate to young people. Your major superiors have said this to you on numerous occasions. More than a mere sign of the superior's will has been manifested.


I mention again that Jim Gschwend remains available to assist you in any way. I also recall your own desire, expressed in the past, to feel more "a part of the province." There exists a variety of ways to encourage that further incorporation; should you need ideas, we can talk about that.

Let us hope that no more alleged incidents come to light. You must understand: the complaints raised in the [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] situations are serious. There must be no more. I am calling you to a prudence greater than that which you have shown in recent years.

4

Brad Schaeffer will review this matter when he completes his work at the General Congregation and returns to Chicago. In the meantime, as Acting Provincial it is my responsibility to safeguard the common good of all those to whom Chicago Province Jesuits minister. I also take very seriously my personal responsibility to you. I look forward to our continuing conversations regarding your health and your ministry in the service of the People of God. I have genuine concern for both.

Sincerely in Christ,



Francis J. Daly, S.J.
Acting Provincial